

copied exactly from the term in Claim 10 of the '637 patent. As Claim 10 was patented in the '637 patent, and the term was acceptable and not indefinite in that patent, it is respectfully submitted that the term is acceptable and not indefinite in the present application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 79-80 and 82 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Hamada (US 6,114,715). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Initially, it is noted that in the rejection, the Examiner states that (46) in Hamada is b) a patterned electrode and e) a light-absorbing auxiliary electrode. The undersigned spoke to the Examiner regarding this double dipping (Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time in discussing the issue). The Examiner recognizes that using the same reference twice to be two different claimed elements of the claimed invention was incorrect. As a result, as the Examiner confirmed, this rejection is incorrect and should be withdrawn.

In addition, gate electrode (46) in Hamada is not in electrical contact with the alleged continuous transparent electrode (108) and is not formed over the gaps between the light emitting elements of the display, as recited in independent Claim 79 of the present application. Further, even if one were to assume that the black-matrix layer (2) in Hamada corresponds to the light-absorbing auxiliary electrode (which Applicants do not admit), the black-matrix layer (2) is not formed over the gaps between the light emitting elements of the display. Hence, Hamada does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are not disclosed or suggested by Hamada and are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claim 84 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Takehashi et al. (US 6,624,473). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claim, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Interference Suggestion

On October 28, 2005, Applicants filed an Interference Suggestion with Claims 79-93.<sup>1</sup> These claims were copied from or are substantially similar to claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19-23 and 28 of US 6,812,637. Pending Claims 79-85 in the present application are still either identical or substantially similar to claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9 and 10 of the '637 patent. Therefore, in accordance with the interference suggestion of October 28, 2005, it is respectfully requested that an interference be declared between the present application and the '637 patent.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants filed a divisional application for the non-elected claims, including Claims 86-93 from this application. Applicants filed an interference suggestion in the divisional application for Claims 86-93 from this application (renumbered in the divisional application) with the '637 patent.